

Lake Arrowhead Municipal Advisory Council 385 North Arrowhead Ave. 5th floor, CA 92415-0110 (909) 387-4833

Meeting Minutes Date/Time: June 6, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. Community Meeting Room, Fire Station 91

301 S. State Hwy 173, Lake Arrowhead, CA

MAC Members Present:

Lawrence Mainez: Chairperson Scott Rindenow: Vice Chairperson Jack Cooperman: Commission Member Sarah Dispenza: Commission Member Voni Saxbury: Commission Member

MAC Members Not Present: N/A

Second District Representative Present: N/A

1.0 Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. followed by the Pledge of Allegiance

2.0 Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the April 4, 2013 LAMAC meeting were not available prior to the meeting therefore this time was continued to next meeting.

3.0 Special Presentations: None

4.0 Community Input: None

5.0 Supervisor's Report: None

6.0 Old Business

a. Lake Arrowhead MAC Work Program Update:

Mainez introduced the item and requested it be an on-going agenda item for discussion and updates and summarized the list of Programs in particular those currently being addressed by the County such as the drug and rehab housing, street paving and striping, and the new speed limit signs along North Bay Road.

The concept that each LAMAC member select a Work Program item voluntarily of their choice and champion its implementation was discussed. This task would involve working with Lewis Murray as time permits and reporting back to the LAMAC with updates. Discussion amongst the LAMAC members ensued with emphasis on whether it was within the purview of the council to work on items not specifically referred by the County Supervisor. Mainez noted that Supervisor Janice Rutherford supported the LAMAC efforts and appreciated the direction the MAC was taking with regards to the Work Program document. Saxbury suggested the local newspaper put together an article to solicit comments on the Work Program. Mainez responded that he was contacted by the local mountain

newspaper and provided them with a full copy of the report (a brief article was published some time ago). Mainez further noted that the Work Program reflects the local values of the community and should be used as a reference to convey to the County Supervisors what is important to the local mountain communities. Mainez informed the LAMAC that he has started work on Priority Item Number 6, "Development Interest Activity Map" and said it would be completed by August. Examples of development information that may be included on the map were discussed, such as potential land development descriptions, developer's contact information, and the status of county entitlements (Santa's Village site was used as a potential development site that may appear on the Map in the future). Rendinow stated his support for the LAMAC Work Program list and suggested the items be further discussed with Lewis Murray rather than assigning to individual Mac members.

Dr. Hugh Bialecki commented how important a Development Interest Map would be for the Mountain Communities.

b. Discussion regarding signs posted in the community.

Cooperman lead a general discussion concerning the proliferation of small signs being posted around the community soliciting services. It was noted that the issue has improved, but suggested Lewis Murray be informed so code enforcement continues to stay on top of this issue. Also noted was the lack of maintenance on the damaged multi-tenant sign located at the Ice Castle Business Center (across from the Blue Jay Cinema).

7.0 New Business

A. SB County Code Amendment related to Residential Care Facilities (sober living, alcohol and drug treatment facilities, etc.): Mainez introduced the item and noted that the County Supervisor referred this draft Ordinance to the LAMAC for comments before any action is taken by the Board of Supervisors. A copy of the draft Ordinance was previously provided to all LAMAC members through Lewis Murray prior to the May 2, 2013 meeting (that meeting was cancelled due to lack of quorum).

Saxbury was concerned that many of the residents in the proposed facilities would be court ordered tenants and there is not much we can do because it may be considered discrimination against the operators. Saxbury asked if these types of facilities are protected under ADA – Mainez responded in the affirmative.

Rindenow was concerned that these types of residential care facilities are becoming the new cottage industry in the mountain communities. It was suggested that the operators of these facilities be invited to a meeting so the LAMAC could learn why they are coming up here (mountain communities) and what their plans are.

Dispenza noted that these types of uses are a business and the operators generate income from their tenants. And asked the question whether the County could get involved if there are 6 or fewer tenants and perhaps we "fight for stronger code enforcement". Dispenza also informed the LAMAC that the County Supervisor has been meeting with facility operators and protestors.

Mainez noted that overall the draft Ordinance appears to do a good job of controlling the proliferation of sober living facilities in the County jurisdictions. However, the draft Ordinance unexpectedly contained provisions for "parolee-probationer" housing type uses. It further categorizes "drug and alcohol rehab" uses as similar type uses to a "parolee-probationer home" use – in other words, the County was essentially saying that someone with a drug and alcohol problem that is trying to get their life back on track is the same as someone recently released from prison with an unknown criminal record living next to our families. Mainez indicated he was shocked by this County determination and recommended the LAMAC strongly oppose such a land use determination and ask that the "parolee-probationer use" be severed from the draft Ordinance. He further explained the following issues concerning the draft Ordinance: 1) the Ordinance includes a provision that the Unlicensed Residential

Care Facilities Applicant information be posted on the Land Use Services website, however he suggested the provision be expanded to require a small informational sign/plague be posted on the subject property; 2) a provision requiring "written policy" precluding visitors who are under the influence to be changed to a "written rule/regulation"; 3) support the provision that the RCF permit is associated with the operator and not the use; 4) recommend that a notice be sent to contiguous property owners as well as posted on site to obtain public comments prior to approving a RCF permit; 5) require a pre-inspection be made by County staff prior to approving a RCF permit; 6) the Ordinance is ambiguous in terms of the number of parolee-probationers permitted per housing unit (i.e. the Ordinance states that a parolee-probationer home is any structure/unit with 2 or more paroleeprobationer, but further states that no combination of 2 parolee-probationer per unit shall be permitted) - it was recommended that the number of parolee-probationer be limited to one (1) per RCF permit if parolee housing cannot be severed from the draft Ordinance; and 7) it is not clear whether the draft Ordinance applies to multi-family housing units - if so it would place an undue concentration of parolee-probationers within an apartment complex putting other tenants and families at risk - it was recommended the Land Use Services Department consult with the County Sheriff Department to determine the appropriate ratio within a multi-family housing complex.

Clarisse Bell [member of the public – no address submitted] asked what was the process for adoption the draft Ordinance? Mainez briefly described the Ordinance adoption process inclusive of the first and second readings of the Ordinance by the County Board of Supervisors.

Mainez asked if there were any further comments from the public – hearing none he asked if the LAMAC had any additional comments.

A motion was made "directing the Chair to prepare formal written comments and submit to Lewis Murray, District Representative to Janice Rutherford for County consideration prior to adopting the subject Code Amendments."

Motion: Dispenza Second: Mainez Absent: N/A Approved: 5/0/0

8.0 Announcements and Future Agenda Items, and schedule

- a. The MAC will be dark in July unless there is a need to comment on the Sober Living Ordinance again.
- b. The next scheduled meeting will be Thursday, August 1, 2013, 7:00 pm at FS91.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 8:37 pm.

*Comments made by members of the public are representative of their views and opinions only. Claims and assertions made during Public Comment are accepted without regard to accuracy and are accepted in accordance with Public Comment rules as outlined in state law. Statements made by the public during Lake Arrowhead Municipal Advisory Council (MAC) meeting do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of individual MAC members or the council as a whole.

Date: